REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed May 6, 2004, Applicant amends his application and requests reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are added or canceled so that claims 1-33 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 13, 22, and 31 are amended to recite storing an association between the executable feature and the graphics element in a map data structure (see Figure 7 of the patent application).

The Official Action rejects claims 1-33 as unpatentable over Parker et al. (US Patent 5,781,720, hereinafter Parker) in view of Tan et al. (US Patent 6,356,902, hereinafter Tan) and further in view of Singh et al. (US Patent 6,415,396, hereinafter Singh). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Official Action contends that Parker teaches a system that does automated testing of a graphical user interface (GUI) environment through the generation of a mapping between GUI objects and their functions. Applicant respectfully submits that this contention is erroneous. The present amended application recites storing an association between the executable feature and the graphics element in a map data structure, wherein the map data structure is accessible by an application driver for driving the software application. By contrast, Parker teaches storing a "[m]apping between high-level logical object names and actual runtime GUI object names" (see column 17, lines 3-4 of Parker, as cited by the Official Action). Clearly, a mapping between high-level names and runtime names is not a mapping of associations between executable code and GUI objects, as recited in amended claims 1, 13, 22, and 31. In fact, there is no explicit disclosure of any mapping between executable features and graphics elements.

The Official Action further contends that "it would be obvious that in order to execute the system as if selection were by a user input the executable features have to be stored in association with graphic elements." However, the executable features do not have to be stored in association with the graphic elements *in a map data structure that is accessible by an application driver for driving the application.* In Parker, as in the conventional systems, the association between graphic elements and executable features is known only in the source code; accordingly, the application driver that drives the application under test has no *a priori* knowledge of which graphics element is associated with which executable code. In the present invention, a mapping of graphics elements to executable code is made before runtime execution of the software application under test. Parker does not teach or suggest this feature, nor do Tan and Signh. Applicants additionally note that Tan relates to multimedia objects, not graphics elements, and is thus not pertinent to the prosecution of

the present application. (see Abstract of Tan). Thus, the combination of Parker, Tan, and Signh cannot teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, as well as prompt allowance of the pending claims, are appropriate and earnestly solicted.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Wesley Ferrebee, Reg. No. 51,312
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: 7/16/04